

LETTERS FROM
THE PEOPLE.

Numerous Communications Conveying Interesting Ideas and Items—The Tide of Reform.

NO LONGER A DEMOCRAT

Says an Old Line Party Man—Kings Letters to the Caucasian Readers—Call on the People to Awake—One Man Must Keep His Mouth Shut—One Has His Foot Thick.

Deal Out the Thundershots.

For the Caucasian.

CLEVELAND MILLS, N. C., May 25—Long may the CAUCASIAN live to deal its thunderbolts into this rotten Democracy. F. Y. HICKS.

Gaining Strength.

For the Caucasian.

DETINY, N. C., May 27—I read the CAUCASIAN regularly and they give it to some else so that it will reach as many people as possible.

I think the reform movement is gaining strength rapidly in this county, and that the Democrats are more demoralized than ever. N. GIBSON.

Enlightening the People.

For the Caucasian.

FANCY HILL, N. C., May 28—I have read Coin's book and think it surmounts all difficulties in the way of any one who is willing and wants to know the true state of affairs in our general government. I think it undoubtedly the best thing I have ever seen on the financial question.

You I will try to get that book scattered all through my section.

I do not want to miss even one copy of the CAUCASIAN. (One of the very best papers of the State and one that is doing more to enlighten the people, that they may be enabled so to act in the future that they may bring relief to themselves.) May the CAUCASIAN widen its borders until it reaches from east to west and from pole to pole. W. B. GIBSON.

Can't be Without It.

For the Caucasian.

LEWISTON, Berke Co., N. C., May 25—We find that we cannot possibly do without the CAUCASIAN as it is the only paper that states political facts as they are, and deduces the best argument to sustain its politics.

Yours truly,

F. V. MITCHELL,

J. B. JOYNER.

Have to Keep My Mouth Shut.

For the Caucasian.

LAGRANGE, N. C., May 28—Have just read "Coin's Financial School" and passed it around among my friends. How dare any man, who has a spark of patriotism left, say, after reading this book, that the gold standard is a blessing to this country. Most of the people in the South have lived up to the facts it contains, and it will take something besides the office holders in the administration to explain it away. The great common people have begun to read and think, and it will be an easy matter for them to decide in the coming elections whether the free coinage of silver or the gold standard is an enemy to the prosperity of the people.

Green for office and money has nearly put out the fire of patriotism kindled by our honored forefathers. Traitorous mouths on all sides are howling for a concoction of selfishness and greed that knows no bounds, and it will be so until shynockism is superseded by Christian patriotism; and God speed the day.

R. B. KINSEY.

Must Keep Them Down.

For the Caucasian.

THURMAN, N. C., May 28—I received "Coin's Financial School," have read it and have studied it well and can recommend it to every one who has any desire to inform himself on our present condition financially. It ought to be placed in every man's hands to read, as well as read and digest it to every man in the State who cannot read. I can assure you I shall not only read it to our people, but talk it to them.

The CAUCASIAN must be put in every hand possible. We must put down the Democratic party and keep it down till they are learned that the whole world does not belong to them, and that the masses of the people have rights as well as they have, and that they must be respected.

W. H. SMITH.

Must Lay on McDuff.

For the Caucasian.

WINTON, N. C., May 28—I received "Coin's School" and think it splendid. I am passing it around to the wavering ones. I think the CAUCASIAN one of the best educators. W. M. KIVETT.

A Tidal Wave of Prosperity.

For the Caucasian.

LENOIR, N. C., May 28—Your paper is setting the people on fire in the State, in enlightening their eyes and working for their interests and not all for the party. * * * I am going to try to pay for—subscriptions or more. Your paper is doing more good than any other in the State. You give people the facts and the truth about the condition of the country. Keep doing the good work. We will cap the climax in 1896 and set our country on a footing again, and then that tidal wave of prosperity will sweep over it.

C. T. SUDDETH.

No More a Democrat.

For the Caucasian.

WACO, N. C., May 18—I have been a silent reader of the CAUCASIAN for quite a while, though not a subscriber. The great pages of truth have convinced me of my error in supporting the Democratic party. I have always belonged to the Democratic party, and supported its nominees. But I boldly make the assertion here that I am no longer a Democrat, but a People's Party man.

The fraud perpetrated in this (Cleveland) county by that party is sickening. Think about a man holding office against the will of the majority of the people as is done in this county! I say let the majority rule, it matters not who is elected.

Hereafter I shall battle for the greater reform movement, and will endeavor to use all my influence in trying to get others to join us. Furthermore I will do all in my power to get the people to read the CAUCASIAN. It has got out among them. It is doing more for reform than any paper published. It brings the spring Democrat to a halt, causes him to meditate and shows him where he stands.

Yours for reform,

R. A. BEAM.

The Lord Only Can See the End.

For the Caucasian.

LILLINGTON, N. C., May 28—I have not been able to * * * on account of the extreme hard times, such as have never been seen in our country. The Lord only can see the end. Who can oppose us in the last election say they think it is good. We are nearly all Populists anyway. We only had forty Democrats last fall out of 300 voters, and they are decreasing very fast. W. F. G.

Z. T. KIVETT.

THE CAUCASIAN.

RALEIGH, N. C., THURSDAY, MAY 30, 1895.

WHERE SILVER IS KING.

Gathering of Western White Metalists at Salt Lake.

SALT LAKE, Utah, May 15.—Representatives of eight States and two Territories chosen either by their respective Governors or the commercial bodies of the main cities, met in a silver convention in this city today.

The town wore a holiday appearance, and thousands of spectators lined the streets as the parade, made up of brass bands and delegates in carriages, went on its way to the great

Mormon Tabernacle, which had been gaily decorated for the occasion.

The delegates numbered about one hundred, and representatives were present from California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah.

GOV. RICKARDS ON THE SILVER ISSUE.

The main addresses of the day were the speech of Gov. Rickards in opening, and an exhaustive paper on the "Silver Question and the evils of monometallism," read by Wharton Baker, the Philadelphia editor, at the evening session, before an audience of 7,000 Gov. Rickards said,

A gentleman who wishes his name withheld, has shown us a letter from Senator Butler in which he answers

to a letter from a Gentleman in this State—Jefferson in favor of the Government Ownership of Railroads.

HE DEFINES A MONOPOLY

Per se and Shows Why They Should be Owned and Operated by the Government—The Policies Will Change Front on the Financial Question—The Money Question First—The Railroad Question Next.

Mossbacks Need a Lesson.

For the Caucasian.

MINEOLA, N. C., May 27.—You will find enclosed 25 cents in stamps for which you will please send me a copy of "Coin's Financial School."

I want the book for the benefit of some of my old mossbacks, goldbugs

Democratic neighbors. While they are scarce and far between in this section, yet we have some of them whom I think need a lesson in the Financial School. Long live the CAUCASIAN to wield the pen for truth.

H. Elliott, N. C., May 16, 1895.

Mr. Elliott, N. C., May 16, 1895.

DEAR SIR: Yours of May 7th, addressed to me at Raleigh, has just been forwarded to me here. I am an incorporated in the country.

Several very strong books have been published on the government ownership of railroads. I have

several of them in my office in Raleigh, and if I were there I would

send you a copy which would fully

answer all your questions and meet all of your objections to that plan in the People's Party platform.

Allow me to call your attention to the historical fact that Thomas Jefferson and the other leading patriots, who formed our Constitution, were uncompromisingly opposed to all kinds of monopolies. They considered monopolies the greatest menace to liberty and the deadliest foe to free institutions. They took the position that any business that affected all or a great portion of the people under a system of regulation by men of small capital, was a government function and should be owned and operated by the government at cost, for the benefit of all the people alike. In short, they were opposed to all monopolies and they were unalterably opposed to allowing private individuals or corporations to have charge of or control any business that was a monopoly per se. They foresaw that private corporations would run such a business, not for the benefit of the people, but would take advantage of the people until they would absolutely own and rule the government just as they did the postal system and the railroads on a telephone at that time our forefathers would have had them run by the government just as the mails are, and for the same reason. If the same parties who are now running the railroads had charge of the postal system, it would cost not less than 10 cents and probably more to send a letter when it can now be sent for two cents under government management. And besides, the people could not get a post office and mail line where they needed it until they convinced the mail monopoly that such an office and such a post office would pay big money into the pockets of the private corporation, or until the people would vote by townships and counties to tax themselves to give the mail monopoly a dollar often to do now to get a post office. They would then have to pay the people to retain its lofty perch. The gold standard is an enemy to the prosperity of the people, but would take advantage of their monopoly to bleed the people for the benefit of the few. The postal system of this country is a monopoly per se. Therefore, on this reasoning, they decided that the postal system should be owned and operated by the government instead of by the people. If there had been railroads on a telephone at that time our forefathers would have had them run by the government just as the mails are, and for the same reason. They called me a silver crank, and said they were opposed to 50 cents in silver dollars, and inflation of the currency. Every leading Democrat in the State claimed that there was more money in circulation than ever before, and established local state units of figures doctored and hatched up by the Secretary of the Treasury to prove their claim. Every day their columns were filled with arguments to try to show that a farmer could buy more with a dollar now than ever before. Then they were asked to explain the cause of the hard times. One day they would say it was because the people were too lazy to work; the next day they would say the people had worked too much and made an overproduction. You remember this very well, and so do the people of this State. Yet now nearly every one of these papers and politicians have suddenly changed front and are loudly denouncing the substance of the evils that we denounced them and are trying to hold louder for financial reform. These men have not changed their principles, for they have none. They are simply trying to fool the people in another way. By the time this financial question is settled the increasing greed and oppression of these railroad monopolies will become so apparent and intolerable to the people, that they will rise up and demand a just and adequate reform of these abuses as strongly as they are now demanding financial reform. When that time comes the same newspapers and politicians who have so suddenly changed front on the financial question will then, with equal dexterity, change front as completely on the transportation question, and for the same reason. By that time, if ever before, the people will have become so thoroughly disgusted with the old party that they will have grown almost as hostile to the People's party, and then the government will be forced to act in a way that will make us all wonder what to do.

Every farmer who has a loan, a business man who is a contractor, the professional man and the manufacturer, all who borrow money must vote for the interests of the banker. This is a fair sample of the gospel of patriotism and liberty as preached by the President of the Bankers Association to the Western Bankers. Is there any excuse for anarchy when such things are urged? Is it any wonder that some of the wisest men are able to predict a revolution in this land? The struggle on and the men who throw anything in the way of the people's cause is not their friend, but their enemy. In time the people drop all party names and designate themselves in a cause that will make this a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. Every farmer, the time-server and newspaper organs of the old parties, who have been fostering the evil and fatening on it, at the expense of the people.

You doubtless remember that a few years ago, when I was President of the State Alliance, my speeches and editorials against the national bank and the gold standard were not popular just as the mail monopoly was.

Now, however, the mail monopoly

is a great success.

It is a great success.

THE CAUCASIAN.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY.

BY THE CAUCASIAN PUBLISHING CO.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES,

ONE YEAR.....	\$1.00
SIX MONTHS.....	.50
THREE MONTHS.....	.35

Entered in the Post Office at Raleigh, N. C.

as second-class mail matter.



THE CAUCASIAN BUILDING.

NOTICE.

THE CAUCASIAN is strictly cash in advance. Watch your label. If you time is about to expire, renew at once and don't miss a single copy.

Don't allow your paper to stop now. Keep it up, and if you want to be of any assistance in the great fight of the people against the money powers, induce some one else to subscribe. The next six months will be full of interest and important discussions, and if you miss a copy, some important point may escape you. Let us line up and march together. We are trying to combat the powers of oppression and disaster. *It is your fight. Are you helping any?*

SOME FACTS CONCERNING THE IN-COME TAX.

The people on mass are the backbone of the country. The country is therefore just as strong as the people choose to make it. When they will to do so, they can sustain every law, good or bad, for the regulation of the country's affairs. When they choose, they can overthrow any law either by violent or peaceful revolution. The people on mass are patient and long suffering; but when they have been continuously deceived and imposed upon, and fully aware to the fact that deception and imposition have been practised on them, they will correct those abuses peaceably if they can—forcefully if they must. These statements are vividly illustrated by history.

Does it not seem then, that the wise course for all men, whether they wield power through wealth or through office, is to see that this power is so exercised as to prevent causes which lead to violent, national disturbances and to the overthrow of government?

The oppressive power of wealth is a matter which is being much studied at this time. The people of this country are beginning to see it more clearly than they have seen it since the revolutionary war. Protests are being made against it. The mutterings and rumblings of discontent are heard from every quarter in the land. But instead of listening to and heeding these ominous warnings, the power of wealth and office is increasing in impudence and arrogance, and openly and brazenly defies the portents of a possible disastrous storm.

The last Congress passed a law imposing a tax on incomes. The tax was not burdensome. This law assumed that an income of \$4,000 a year was sufficient to supply any man or family with every actual necessity and many of the luxuries of life. An income not exceeding that amount was therefore left untaxed. The further assumption was that the sources from which an income was derived had the protection of the government, and after allowing a handsome sufficiency for any man, said that any more than a sufficiency should contribute little something to the expense incurred by the government for protecting it. Any intelligent man can see that this law was one of justice and equity.

There are men and corporations in the country whose incomes are immense; and though all have been made valuable by the presence of the people and protested by the government, they did not want to pay for this protection. They therefore went before the highest court in the land. They told this court that men of property were being taxed; and they virtually asked the court to declare the tax "unconstitutional."

A little study of the results of this movement is interesting. The Court is composed of nine Judges. Eight of them heard the case. A majority of them decided that incomes from bonds and real estate could not be taxed. The only men on earth who do not work, but live on the work of others, are those who own large amounts of bonds and real estate. They get interest on bonds. They collect rents from real estate. These are the men who, according to the Court must not be taxed. There are men who work farms and operate factories, who conduct industrial establishments and give employment to many people. These are the men

who create the wealth with which the interest on the bonds is paid, and which pays the rent for the real estate. A number of these men make as much as \$4,000 a year. The Court left the law so that these men could be taxed. Four of the eight Judges who heard the case said they could be taxed and four said not. This left the law in force as to the men who worked. Judge Jackson, the ninth Judge, was not on the bench when this decision was made.

Do you see? The blotted bondholder, the land grabber must be let alone. The worker must step up and pay taxes for the privilege of paying the bondholders their interest and the land grabbers their rents.

The storm of indignation which that decision evoked led to a rehearing of the case when all of the nine judges were present. The old plutocratic and monopoly papers had much to say about how Judge Jackson would decide. They went so far as to announce that he would decide the whole law unconstitutional, and that this decision would wipe the whole law of the books. The bondholders, &c., were delighted at this announcement. They knew that the people would not quietly submit to a decision which would tax the incomes of one class of citizens and not tax another class. If he would decide the tax on workers, the entire law must go, and that would settle the matter.

As we have said above, it has already been decided by the Supreme court of this State, by the Supreme court of the United States and by the Supreme court of many states that a court could not impeach the record of a co-ordinate branch of the government.

To take another view of the matter, let us suppose that a Justice of the Peace should entertain a suit to try title to land in which proceeding perjury, bribery, fraud and other such wrongs were alleged. The court, without entering into the question of the wrongs alleged, would simply hold that a Justice of the Peace has no jurisdiction to try title, and would therefore dismiss the action. But how could the Supreme court in the case of this mortgage law have "turned on the light" if it had decided differently?

Every lawyer in the State knows that Governor Carr made no effort to insist upon; but the bondholders, &c., must not be taxed under any sort of conditions. But if they are not taxed, there will be trouble over taxing the workers. What can be done? Justice Shiras changes his opinion. He comes and says the whole law is unconstitutional. In other words, his last decision meant if the workers could not be taxed without taxing the bondholders, then nobody should be taxed.

These are the facts in the two cases.

Can any intelligent man read them and study them without thinking there is trickery or corruption somewhere?

There was great rejoicing among the shrocks, bondholders, &c., when the news was announced. An illustration of it is given by the New York World of May 24th, which says editorially:

"As soon as the income tax decision of the Supreme court exempting wealth from taxation became known in this city, rich heads of big moneyed corporations flocked out of their offices into Wall street and down the street, lively, with their antics, and the market, like a bunch of sloppings each other on the back, chuckling and almost dancing 'on the sidewalk, while they went up. 'We've got them! We've

got them!'

Does it not seem then, that the wise course for all men, whether they wield power through wealth or through office, is to see that this power is so exercised as to prevent causes which lead to violent, national disturbances and to the overthrow of government?

Mr. Carlisle, Secretary of the Treasury, made the leading speech. It appears to be a mixture of good and bad. The bad part is a stubborn adherence to the theory that this country cannot have bimetallism independent of Europe. He still cringes to the London Jew syndicates and bankers, who made the speech. The chief speaker of the occasion. We surmise that these figures could be split into without injustice to facts; but we have nothing to do with that.

Mr. Carlisle, Secretary of the Treasury, referred to the decision of the Supreme court in the case of Carr vs Coke. The majority of the court sustained Judge Starbuck in finding that the court had no jurisdiction in that matter—that is, that the court had no power to go behind the final record of the legislature, which is in this case is in due form, witnessed by the admittedly genuine signatures of the presiding officers of the respective branches of the General Assembly and filed in the office of the Secretary of State. It was a question of power in the court (and not a question of desire or inclination of the court) to investigate journals and other history of the proceedings of the legislature as a co-ordinate branch of the State government.

When an act of the General Assembly is, on its face, in due form, ratified and signed by the presiding officers of each House and filed in the office of the Secretary of State, it becomes a record *unassailable*, according to the English authorities, and had so been held by the Supreme court of the United States heretofore and by numerous decisions in other States. And this is exactly what the present court has decided.

It was a question of jurisdiction in the court and not a question of what was done by the Legislature.

The court holds that if any remedy is needed that is with the legislature only to give it. This opinion was concurred in by a majority of the court, viz, Chief Justice Faircloth and Justices Montgomery and Furches, and they are supported by the great weight of authority in this and other countries. Justice Avery and Clark dissented to the opinion.

We regret that the court could not have rendered an unanimous decision in this case as they have done even in all purely political questions that have come before the court.

We do not question the honesty or sincerity of any of the members of the court. We have every reason to believe that each member of the court was guided by his oath and

his honest judgment. But the News & Observer, as usual, misstates the question, either from ignorance or from a desire to falsify and to misrepresent. It not only misstates the question, but it goes beyond the bounds of decency, and charges that the court was prompted by base motives. We make the following extract:

"The public will regard the denial of the News & Observer as an investigation of evidence of willingness on the part of the majority to cover up the crime of the rascal who forged three thousand mortgage law and other bills that was denied by parties who were

paid to pay it."

Farther on in the same editorial the News & Observer says:

"The 'non-partisan' judiciary refuses to 'turn on the light.'"

This is a disreputable and contemptible effort to prejudice the court before the people. The court has been so fair, able and "non-partisan" that every citizen in the State has cause to be proud of it, and it was to be hoped that the News & Observer if it did not have the manhood to command it, would at least have the decency to be silent.

As we have said above, it has already been decided by the Supreme court of this State, by the Supreme court of the United States and by the Supreme court of many states that a court could not impeach the record of a co-ordinate branch of the government.

To take another view of the matter, let us suppose that a Justice of the Peace should entertain a suit to try title to land in which proceeding perjury, bribery, fraud and other such wrongs were alleged. The court, without entering into the question of the wrongs alleged, would simply hold that a Justice of the Peace has no jurisdiction to try title, and would therefore dismiss the action. But how could the Supreme court in the case of this mortgage law have "turned on the light" if it had decided differently?

Every lawyer in the State knows that Governor Carr made no effort to insist upon; but the bondholders, &c., must not be taxed under any sort of conditions. But if they are not taxed, there will be trouble over taxing the workers. What can be done? Justice Shiras changes his opinion. He comes and says the whole law is unconstitutional.

He admits that she copied the bill—so it is the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out.

Everybody knows that the law was a fraud, but no one is now claiming against the law except those who want to defraud their creditors and those who want to take mortgages. What the people want to know is who the *man* or the *person* who committed the fraud, and the people also want to know why the real parties were not brought forward in the proceeding by Governor Carr.

THE MEMPHIS "SOUND MONEY" CONVENTION.

We have announced from time to time the "sound money" convention scheduled to occur at Memphis on May 23rd. It has occurred. The dispatches state that there were nearly one thousand delegates present, and that eight thousand people heard the chief speaker of the occasion.

We surmise that these figures could be split into without injustice to facts; but we have nothing to do with that.

Mr. Carlisle, Secretary of the Treasury, made the leading speech.

It appears to be a mixture of good and bad. The bad part is a stubborn adherence to the theory that this country cannot have bimetallism independent of Europe. He still cringes to the London Jew syndicates and bankers, who made the speech.

The chief speaker of the occasion.

We surmise that these figures could be split into without injustice to facts; but we have nothing to do with that.

Mr. Carlisle, Secretary of the Treasury, referred to the decision of the Supreme court in the case of Carr vs Coke.

The majority of the court sustained Judge Starbuck in finding that the court had no jurisdiction in that matter—that is, that the court had no power to go behind the final record of the legislature, which is in this case is in due form, witnessed by the admittedly genuine signatures of the presiding officers of the respective branches of the General Assembly and filed in the office of the Secretary of State.

It was a question of power in the court (and not a question of desire or inclination of the court) to investigate journals and other history of the proceedings of the legislature as a co-ordinate branch of the State government.

When an act of the General Assembly is, on its face, in due form, ratified and signed by the presiding officers of each House and filed in the office of the Secretary of State, it becomes a record *unassailable*, according to the English authorities, and had so been held by the Supreme court of the United States heretofore and by numerous decisions in other States. And this is exactly what the present court has decided.

It was a question of jurisdiction in the court and not a question of what was done by the Legislature.

The court holds that if any remedy is needed that is with the legislature only to give it. This opinion was concurred in by a majority of the court, viz, Chief Justice Faircloth and Justices Montgomery and Furches, and they are supported by the great weight of authority in this and other countries. Justice Avery and Clark dissented to the opinion.

We regret that the court could not have rendered an unanimous decision in this case as they have done even in all purely political questions that have come before the court.

We do not question the honesty or sincerity of any of the members of the court. We have every reason to believe that each member of the court was guided by his oath and

his honest judgment. But the News & Observer, as usual, misstates the question, either from ignorance or from a desire to falsify and to misrepresent. It not only misstates the question, but it goes beyond the bounds of decency, and charges that the court was prompted by base motives. We make the following extract:

"The public will regard the denial of the News & Observer as an investigation of evidence of willingness on the part of the majority to cover up the crime of the rascal who forged three thousand mortgage law and other bills that was denied by parties who were

paid to pay it."

Farther on in the same editorial the News & Observer says:

"The 'non-partisan' judiciary refuses to 'turn on the light.'"

This is a disreputable and contemptible effort to prejudice the court before the people. The court has been so fair, able and "non-partisan" that every citizen in the State has cause to be proud of it, and it was to be hoped that the News & Observer if it did not have the manhood to command it, would at least have the decency to be silent.

As we have said above, it has already been decided by the Supreme court of this State, by the Supreme court of the United States and by the Supreme court of many states that a court could not impeach the record of a co-ordinate branch of the government.

To take another view of the matter, let us suppose that a Justice of the Peace should entertain a suit to try title to land in which proceeding perjury, bribery, fraud and other such wrongs were alleged. The court, without entering into the question of the wrongs alleged, would simply hold that a Justice of the Peace has no jurisdiction to try title, and would therefore dismiss the action. But how could the Supreme court in the case of this mortgage law have "turned on the light" if it had decided differently?

Every lawyer in the State knows that Governor Carr made no effort to insist upon; but the bondholders, &c., must not be taxed under any sort of conditions. But if they are not taxed, there will be trouble over taxing the workers. What can be done? Justice Shiras changes his opinion. He comes and says the whole law is unconstitutional.

He admits that she copied the bill—so it is the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out.

Everybody knows that the law was a fraud, but no one is now claiming against the law except those who want to defraud their creditors and those who want to take mortgages. What the people want to know is who the *man* or the *person* who committed the fraud, and the people also want to know why the real parties were not brought forward in the proceeding by Governor Carr.

THE MEMPHIS "SOUND MONEY" CONVENTION.

We have announced from time to time the "sound money" convention scheduled to occur at Memphis on May 23rd. It has occurred. The dispatches state that there were nearly one thousand delegates present, and that eight thousand people heard the chief speaker of the occasion.

We surmise that these figures could be split into without injustice to facts; but we have nothing to do with that.

Mr. Carlisle, Secretary of the Treasury, made the leading speech.

It appears to be a mixture of good and bad. The bad part is a stubborn adherence to the theory that this country cannot have bimetallism independent of Europe. He still cringes to the London Jew syndicates and bankers, who made the speech.

The chief speaker of the occasion.

We surmise that these figures could be split into without injustice to facts; but we have nothing to do with that.

Mr. Carlisle, Secretary of the Treasury, referred to the decision of the Supreme court in the case of Carr vs Coke.

The majority of the court sustained Judge Starbuck in finding that the court had no jurisdiction in that matter—that is, that the court had no power to go behind the final record of the legislature, which is in this case is in due form, witnessed by the admittedly genuine signatures of the presiding officers of the respective branches of the General Assembly and filed in the office of the Secretary of State.

It was a question of power in the court (and not a question of desire or inclination of the court) to investigate journals and other history of the proceedings of the legislature as a co-ordinate branch of the State government.

When an act of the General Assembly is, on its face, in due form, ratified and signed by the presiding officers of each House and filed in the office of the Secretary of State, it becomes a record *unassailable*, according to the English authorities, and had so been held by the Supreme court of the United States heretofore and by numerous decisions in other States. And this is exactly what the present court has decided.

It was a question of jurisdiction in the court and not a question of what was done by the Legislature.

The court holds that if any remedy is needed that is with the legislature only to give it. This opinion was concurred in by a majority of the court, viz, Chief Justice Faircloth and Justices Montgomery and Furches, and they are supported by the great weight of authority in this and other countries. Justice Avery and Clark dissented to the opinion.

We regret that the court could not have rendered an unanimous decision in this case as they have done even in all purely political questions that have come before the court.

We do not question the honesty or sincerity of any of the members of the court. We have every reason to believe that each member of the court was guided by his oath and

his honest judgment. But the News & Observer, as usual, misstates the question, either from ignorance or from a desire to falsify and to misrepresent. It not only misstates the question, but it goes beyond the bounds of decency, and charges that the court was prompted by base motives. We make the following extract:

</

